# DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

# SUGARBUSH RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT PROJECT
GPA 05-010/TM 5295RPL7/R04-008/SP 03-003/
S04-015/LOG NO. 02-08-047
SCH No. 2005121098

Lead Agency:

**COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO**
**DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND LAND USE**
5201 Ruffin Road, Suite B
San Diego, California 92123
Contact: Robert Hingtgen, DPLU Project Manager
and Environmental Coordinator
(858) 694-3712

Prepared by:

Andrea Bitterling and Lisa Capper
**HELIX ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING, INC.**
7578 El Cajon Boulevard, Suite 200
La Mesa, California 91942

Project Proponent:

Robert A. Booker
**SUGARBUSH, LLC**

OCTOBER 2009

# SUGARBUSH RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT PROJECT
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

**Page**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont.)**

**Page**

**CHAPTER 2.0 – SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT (cont.)**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont.)**

**Page**

**CHAPTER 3.0 - ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS FOUND NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT**



**CHAPTER 4.0 – PROJECT ALTERNATIVES**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont.)



## LIST OF FIGURES

## TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont.)

### LIST OF FIGURES (cont.)



### LIST OF TABLES

**TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont.)**

**LIST OF TABLES**
**(cont.)**

## LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

| | |
|---|---|
| A70 | Limited Agriculture Zone |
| AB | Assembly Bill |
| ACOE | U.S. Army Corps of Engineers |
| ADT | average daily trips |
| AGR | agricultural supply |
| AEP | Association of Environmental Professionals |
| amsl | above mean sea level |
| APCD | San Diego County Air Pollution Control District |
| APN | Assessor's Parcel Number |
| AQUA | aquaculture |
| ARB | California Air Resources Board |
| AWSC | all-way stop controlled |
| | |
| B | Boron |
| BAT | best available technology |
| BCT | best conventional pollutant control technology |
| BIOL | biological habitats of special significance |
| BMI | benthic macroinvertebrate |
| BMO | Biological Mitigation Ordinance |
| BMPs | best management practices |
| BOD | Biochemical Oxygen Demand |
| BSD | Buena Sanitation District |
| BTU | British thermal units |
| | |
| CAA | Clean Air Act |
| CAAQS | California Ambient Air Quality Standard |
| CAFÉ | Corporate Average Fuel Economy |
| CalEPA | California Environmental Protection Agency |
| CALINE4 | California Line Source Dispersion Model (Version 4) |
| Caltrans | California Department of Transportation |
| CAPCOA | California Air Pollution Control Officers' Association |
| CASQA | California Stormwater Quality Association |
| CBC | California Building Code |
| CCAP | Climate Change Action Plan |
| CCAR | California Climate Action Registry |
| CDFG | California Department of Fish and Game |
| CEQA | California Environmental Quality Act |
| CESA | California Endangered Species Act |
| cfs | cubic square feet |
| CGS | California Geologic Survey |
| $CH_4$ | methane |
| CIP | Capital Improvement Project |
| CIWMB | California Integrated Waste Management Board |
| Cl | chlorides |
| CLUP | Comprehensive Land Use Plan |
| CNEL | community noise equivalent level |
| CO | carbon monoxide |
| $CO_2$ | carbon dioxide |
| $CO_2e$ | carbon dioxide equivalent |

| | |
|---|---|
| COD | chemical oxygen demand |
| COM | commercial |
| COMM | commercial and sport fishing |
| County | County of San Diego |
| CRDA | Country Residential Development Area |
| Cu | copper |
| CWA | Clean Water Act |
| | |
| dB | decibel |
| dBA | A-weighted decibel |
| DPLU | Department of Planning and Land Use |
| DPW | Department of Public Works |
| DWR | California Department of Water Resources |
| EDA | Estate Development Area |
| EIR | Environmental Impact Report |
| EMFAC2007 | Caltrans emission factor model for on-road traffic |
| ESA | Endangered Species Act |
| EST | estuarine habitat |
| F | fluoride |
| Fe | iron |
| FEMA | Federal Emergency Management Agency |
| FHWA | Federal Highway Administration |
| FIRM | Flood Insurance Rate Maps |
| FPA | Focused Planning Area |
| FPP | Fire Protection Plan |
| | |
| g | acceleration due to gravity |
| GCC | global climate change |
| GHGs | greenhouse gases |
| GPA | General Plan Amendment |
| gpm | gallons per minute |
| GWP | global warming potential |
| | |
| $H_2S$ | hydrogen sulfide |
| HA | hydrologic area |
| HELIX | HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc. |
| HEM | Habitat Evaluation Model |
| HCM | Highway Capacity Manual |
| HCP | habitat conservation plan |
| HDR | high-density residential |
| HLP | Habitat Loss Permit |
| HLTH | health services |
| HMP | Habitat Management Plan |
| HOA | homeowners' association |
| HP | horsepower |
| HSA | hydrologic subarea |
| HU | hydrologic unit |
| | |
| I- | Interstate |
| IBC | International Building Code |
| IBI | Index of Biotic Integrity |
| IND | industrial |

| | |
|---|---|
| IPCC | Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change |
| ITE | Institute of Transportation Engineers |
| ITS | Institute of Transportation Studies |
| | |
| lb/acre/day | pounds per acre per day |
| LCFS | Low Carbon Fuel Standard |
| LDR | low-density residential |
| $L_{eq}$ | equivalent sound level |
| LID | low impact development |
| LLG | Linscott, Law & Greenspan |
| LOS | level of service |
| LPC | Light Pollution Code |
| | |
| MAR | marine habitat |
| MBAS | methylene blue activated substances |
| MBTA | Migratory Bird Treaty Act |
| MDR | medium-density residential |
| MEP | maximum extent practicable |
| $mg/m^3$ | milligrams per cubic meter |
| MHCP | Multiple Habitat Conservation Plan |
| MIGR | migration of aquatic organisms |
| MMT | million metric tons |
| Mn | manganese |
| MND | Mitigated Negative Declaration |
| mph | miles per hour |
| MRZ-3 | undetermined mineral resources |
| MSCP | Multiple Species Conservation Program |
| MU | mixed use |
| MUN | municipal and domestic supply |
| MWh | megawatt hours |
| | |
| N/A | not available/insufficient data |
| N&P | nitrogen and phosphorus |
| $N_2O$ | nitrous oxide |
| Na | sodium |
| NAAQS | National Ambient Air Quality Standard |
| NAHC | Native American Heritage Commission |
| NCCP | Natural Communities Conservation Planning |
| NCM | North County Metropolitan |
| NDIR | non-dispersive infrared spectroscopy |
| $NH_3 – N$ | ammonia – nitrogen |
| NPDES | National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System |
| $NO_2$ | nitrogen dioxide |
| $NO_2 + NO_3 – N$ | nitrite + nitrate – nitrogen |
| $NO_3$ | nitrate |
| NOP | Notice of Preparation |
| $NO_x$ | oxides of nitrogen |
| NSLU | noise-sensitive land use |
| NTU | nephelometric turbidity units |
| | |
| $O_3$ | ozone |
| OEHHA | Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment |

| | |
|---|---|
| OPR | Office of Planning and |
| P | planned/pending |
| PAMA | Pre-approved Mitigation Area |
| Pb | lead |
| PF | public facility |
| PLDO | Park Lands Dedication Ordinance |
| $PM_{2.5}$ | fine particulate matter (particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter of 2.5 microns or less) |
| $PM_{10}$ | respirable particulate matter (particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter of 10 microns or less) |
| ppm | parts per million |
| Protocol | Caltrans ITS Transportation Project-Level Carbon Monoxide Protocol |
| R | rezone |
| RAQS | San Diego County Regional Air Quality Strategy |
| RARE | rare, threatened, or endangered species |
| REC1 | contact water recreation |
| REC2 | non-contact water recreation |
| RES | residential |
| RMP | Resource Management Plan |
| ROCs | reactive organic compounds |
| RPO | Resource Protection Ordinance |
| RTIP | Regional Transportation Improvement Program |
| RWQCB | Regional Water Quality Control Board |
| S | Site Plan |
| S82 | Extractive Use zone |
| S88 | Specific Planning Area zone |
| SANDAG | San Diego Association of Governments |
| SANTEC | San Diego Traffic Engineers' Council |
| SCAQMD | South Coast Air Quality Management District |
| SCIC | South Coastal Information Center |
| SDAB | San Diego Air Basin |
| SDCGGI | San Diego County Greenhouse Gas Inventory |
| SDCWA | San Diego County Water Authority |
| $SF_6$ | sulfur hexafluoride |
| SHELL | shellfish harvesting |
| SIP | State Implementation Plan |
| $SO_2$ | sulfur dioxide |
| $SO_4$ | sulfate |
| $SO_x$ | oxides of sulfur |
| SP | Specific Plan |
| SPA | Specific Plan Amendment |
| SPWN | spawning, reproduction, and/or early development |
| SR- | State Route |
| SR-10 | semi-rural residential |
| SRA | Scientific Resources Associated |
| STP | shovel test pit |
| SUSMP | Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan |
| SWMP | Stormwater Management Plan |
| SWPPP | Storm Water Pollution Prevention Program |
| SWSAS | Storm Water Sampling and Analysis Strategy |

| | |
|---|---|
| TACs | toxic air contaminants |
| T-BACT | Toxics Best Available Control Technology |
| TDS | total dissolved solids |
| TIA | Traffic Impact Analysis |
| TIF | Traffic Impact Fee |
| TIS | Traffic Impact Study |
| TKL | total Kjeldahl nitrogen |
| TM | Tentative Map |
| TMDL | total maximum daily load |
| TP | total phosphorous |
| TRB | Transportation Resources Board |
| TSS | total suspended solids |
| Turb | turbidity |
| TWSC | two-way stop controlled |
| UNFCCC | United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change |
| UR | under review |
| URMP | urban runoff management programs |
| U.S. | United States |
| USEPA | United States Environmental Protection Agency |
| USFWS | United States Fish and Wildlife Service |
| USGS | United States Geological Survey |
| UWMP | Urban Waste Management Plan |
| V/C | volume-to-capacity |
| VC/GS | Visiting Commercial/Gas Station |
| VFPD | Vista Fire Protection District |
| VID | Vista Irrigation District |
| VMT | vehicle miles traveled |
| VOCs | volatile organic compounds |
| VR-2 | Village Residential |
| VTM | Vesting Tentative Map |
| WARM | warm freshwater |
| WILD | wildlife habitat |
| Weston | Weston Solutions, Inc. |
| Zn | zinc |
| $\mu g/m^3$ | micrograms per cubic meter |

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

# SUMMARY

# SUMMARY

## S.1 Project Synopsis

### Project Description

The Sugarbush project (hereafter referred to as the "Proposed Project" or "Project") proposes development of 45 single-family residences, internal roads and associated infrastructure (including detention/bioretention basins in the western portion of the property) on 115.5 acres owned by the Project Applicant. Secondary emergency access would be provided to the site from the west along existing road right-of-way. Supporting documentation providing Project detail includes a General Plan Amendment Report (GPA 05-010), Specific Plan (SP03-003), Rezone (R04-008), Tentative Map (TM 5295RPL7) and Site Plan (S04-015). The Specific Plan (under separate cover) establishes land uses, residential densities, development standards and essential infrastructure facilities designed with specific attention to the natural environment of the site and the semi-rural character of the surrounding properties.

***Project's Component Parts***

Independent elements that comprise the overall Project include Grading and Construction, On-site Circulation/Parking, Utilities, Off-site Improvements, Residential Structures, Walls and Fencing, Retained Easements, Open Space, and Landscape, as described below.

Development Detail

The Project discretionary applications include a General Plan Amendment; Specific Plan, Tentative Map and Site Plan; and Zoning Reclassification. These discretionary actions are described in Subchapter 1.2.

Grading and Construction

Sugarbush would be developed over an approximately two-to-three year period based on market conditions. Initial improvements would entail grading of the Sugarbush Drive extension through the site. Commensurate with this effort would be connection to water and sewer utilities and improvements to the Cleveland Trail emergency access route. Pad preparation and on-site utilities/infrastructure construction would occur simultaneously toward the end of site preparation. House construction would occur subsequent to road and utility installation.

Total grading for the Project is projected to consist of approximately 322,000 cubic yards of cut and 322,000 cubic yards of fill, balanced on site. Approximately five acres or less would be graded on any single day. Rock breaking activities and/or blasting may occur where grading equipment cannot break rock adequate to reach required cut levels. Depending upon the size of rocks created, additional breaking may be required prior to on-site use in deep fill. Project design elements related to these activities include required sizing of blasting charges, as well as the use of chemical breaking agents where off-site uses are located within 200 feet of removed bedrock. Grading would require approximately four to six months.

Constructed slopes generally would have a maximum 2:1 steepness, with 1.5:1 slopes proposed along a portion of Sugarbush Drive. Grading overall would start in the west to prepare key ways for fill slopes before moving to cuts on the east, then transferring the dirt on site to the prepared key fill areas.

The slopes that would be created along the western Project boundary would range in size from approximately 30 feet to 42 feet in height, and would be created along approximately 1,520 linear feet of

the 2,600-linear foot western property line. Slopes along the western property line at the detention/bioretention basins would be smaller, ranging in size from approximately 4 feet to 15 feet high.

Construction vehicles would include haul/material trucks, scrapers, dozers, graders, loaders, pavers, compactors, concrete trucks, water trucks, a Pettibone crane and ancillary operating equipment such as diesel-electric generators and lifts. A maximum of 25 daily construction truck trips would occur during the grading and site preparation phase, with 15 daily construction truck trips during overlap of site preparation and site utilities and the site utilities/infrastructure construction phase. Numbers of workers on site at any one time are anticipated to range from approximately 25 to 120 workers. The construction staging area(s) would be located on site, wholly within the development footprint. Construction vehicle access to the site would be via Sugarbush Drive.

On-site Circulation/Parking

Primary access would continue on site from the current terminus of Sugarbush Drive at the northeastern Project property boundary. This public road would be located within a 60-foot-wide easement, and have a paved width of 40 feet. On-site, Sugarbush Drive would be bordered by open space on both sides of the road for approximately 1,200 feet. A five-foot-wide decomposed granite pathway would be located 20 feet from centerline within the right-of-way. Guardrails would be installed in appropriate locations. Residential loop streets (Streets B, C, and D) extending south of extended Sugarbush Drive would be paved to 32 feet in width within a 52-foot-wide right-of-way. Five-foot-wide decomposed granite pathways would be located 16 feet from centerline. Street E would extend west from Street B to the western Project boundary, Street E would be paved to 24 feet in width and would be gated at both its eastern and western extents.

Utilities

Utilities would be extended throughout the Project, and would link into existing off-site facilities. The Project would extend an eight-inch sewer line approximately 1,200 feet, within Cleveland Trail easements, connecting the Project to an existing line in Buena Creek Road. The Project also would extend 10-inch water lines through the Project within extended Sugarbush Drive and 8-inch lines southerly through the residential development. Connections would be made to existing lines in existing Sugarbush Drive, Lone Oak Lane, Cleveland Trail and Buena Creek Road. Areas in which improvements would require extending beyond currently disturbed areas are addressed within environmental analysis in this EIR.

Off-site Improvements

The Project TM includes a gated emergency access road north of Lot 1 and crossing Lot F. This road would connect to existing Cleveland Trail. Cleveland Trail would provide emergency secondary access/egress to/from the site for service providers and residents. Project-related improvements to Cleveland Trail roadbed would occur strictly within the existing 30-foot-wide right-of-way. Existing hardscape generally would be repaved to 24 feet in width and portions currently consisting of packed dirt also would be paved. For a distance of 50 feet in the vicinity of Buena Creek, the crossing would remain in its current condition, with a concrete dip section over a 36-inch-wide culvert. This intersection with Buena Creek Road would also be realigned, bringing Cleveland Trail to Buena Creek Road in more of a "T" formation and improving sight lines to the north and south. Brush clearance and grading would occur on the south side of Buena Creek Road, both east and west of its intersection with Sugarbush Drive in order to establish adequate lines of sight associated with current speeds of cross traffic along Buena Creek Road. This would include initial clearance, slope modification, hydroseeding with a native (sage scrub) habitat erosion control hydroseed, and construction of a retaining wall.

Residential Structures

All of the Project's 45 homes would be located on the west side of the property, avoiding the drainage in the north-central portion of the site and the steeper portions of the site to the east. Eight residential lots along the western boundary ranging in size from 0.54 to 0.77 acre would abut seven existing residential properties to the west ranging from 0.59 to 2.42 acres. Buildings would be set back from the western property line by 100 feet and ultimately would be surrounded by individually landscaped yards. Homes would be a maximum of 30 feet in height.

Walls and Fencing

Fencing at top of slope (edge of pad) for the eight residences located along the western property boundary would be constructed of open iron fencing painted in black or dark green. Concrete split rail fencing would be provided along both north and south sides of Sugarbush Drive between property entry at the Project's northern boundary and Sugarbush Drive terminus at the development bubble.

Retained Easements

Easements to abutting parcels have been incorporated into Project design. The area covered by these easements is not included in numbers for biological open space preserved by the Project. One easement is 52 feet in width and would provide access to Assessors' Parcel Number (APN) 184-280-03 south of the development bubble. The second easement would be 40 feet wide and would provide access to APN 184-101-26, south of the Project eastern panhandle.

Open Space

Approximately 67 percent of the Project property, or 77.6 acres, would be retained in open space, protecting steep slopes, biologically viable habitat and sensitive vegetation north of Cleveland Trail. The open space easements would be managed by a local conservancy approved by the County of San Diego (County) and resource agency staff, focused on preservation of its biological value. This value consists of biological functions provided to the threatened coastal California gnatcatcher in on-site Diegan coastal sage scrub, as well as foraging values provided to raptors in non-native grasslands and preservation of oak stands, pursuant to a Habitat Management Plan (HMP, Appendix H of EIR Appendix D) to be approved prior to approval of grading plans or the final map.

Landscaping

The Project Conceptual Landscape Plan proposes a wide range of potential plant species. No plants identified in the Project FPP (Appendix B) as undesirable due to their flammable nature are included in the conceptual plan. The planting scheme provides for large shrub and tree groupings arranged in a mosaic pattern throughout the Project. Larger specimen trees would be installed at entries and key locations throughout the development to provide a unifying element throughout the Sugarbush development, regardless of individual home planting. All planting along the Project perimeters and Sugarbush Drive would be installed and maintained by the homeowner's association (HOA), in order to maintain consistent elements within areas subject to public views. Proposed trees include broad-leaf evergreen to coniferous and deciduous species, ranging from 20 to 60 feet in height and including drought-tolerant species. Shrubs include large flowering species ranging from 3 to 12 feet in height to low-growing groundcovers. The conceptual landscape plan would be refined during final site plan preparation and would be implemented as soon as grading is completed and utilities are available in order to screen graded slopes as soon as possible.

Detention/Bioretention Basins

Three detention/bioretention basins would be located along the western property boundary on lots E and F and would filter stormwater/site runoff anticipated to reach the Buena Creek drainage. The basins are designed to have high pollutant removal capacity for coarse sediment, trash and pollutants such as nutrients, heavy metals and pesticides. The northernmost basin on Lot F would be located immediately west of the Sugarbush Drive terminus and north of the emergency access/turn-around extension to off-site Cleveland Trail. An additional basin would be located immediately south of the turn-around. The southernmost basin (Lot E) would be located just south of Lot 5 and north of Lot 6. Grading for these lots would create berms as well as excavate into the lots in order to create the basins. Lot perimeters would be landscaped and maintained by the HOA consistent with residential standards for the western perimeter. A retaining wall up to 9 feet in height and 90 feet in length facing northward would be associated with the southern basin on Lot F. Other retaining walls associated with the detention/bioretention basins would be interior to lots E and F.

**Project Location**

The Project site is located in an unincorporated area of north San Diego County at the terminus of Sugarbush Drive, in the North County Metropolitan (NCM) Subregional Plan area. The easternmost portion of the site is located in the Twin Oaks Valley Sponsor Group area. The primary roadway in the immediate vicinity of the Project is Buena Creek Road. Smaller (paved and unpaved) roads providing access to residential properties abutting the project area include Lone Oak Lane, Cleveland Trail and Fredas Hill Road.

**Environmental Setting**

***Project Vicinity Characteristics***

To the immediate north, northeast and northwest, are a series of small hills and knolls vegetated with orchards, non-native grassland, coastal sage, and chaparral scrub. Buena Creek is located west and north of the Project. The eastern boundary of the site is bordered by a steep-sided landform that rises approximately 455 above the highest portion of the Sugarbush Project site. Roughly bordering the southern portion of the site is a northeast-trending broad knoll. A canyon drops steeply away to the south and opens in a southwesterly direction. These areas are vegetated primarily with coastal sage scrub and some chaparral scrub.

The immediate setting of the proposed Sugarbush development also includes single-family homes on 0.5- to over 2-acre lots along Sugarbush Drive north of the Project site and in the Lone Oak Lane neighborhood adjacent to the west. Many of these residences incorporate agricultural plantings. Existing homes in the area generally are custom built (as opposed to tract homes) and range in size from relatively small (1,600 square feet) to larger estate homes.

Oak and riparian woodland begin on the western panhandle of the Project site along a drainage that continues to the west along Cleveland Trail to Buena Creek. Buena Creek flows to the southwest along the south side of Buena Creek Road.

***Site Characteristics***

The Project site is situated among a group of hills south of Buena Creek Road. The western portion of the property is relatively flat, and generally rises north to south. Segments of the northern and eastern

portions of the site consist of steep slopes or ridges that extend south and east of the site, respectively. A disjointed drainage feature is located in the "valley" portion in the more northern part of the site. Elevations within the Project site range from approximately 565 feet to 1,050 feet amsl.

The site is at the northernmost portion of a large block (approximately 1,500 acres) of undeveloped land that extends from Buena Creek to the City of San Marcos, and abuts developed lands to the west and north. On-site elements consist of open space with dirt roads and trails, knolls, steep sloping hillsides, remnant orchard, and some disturbance due to the keeping of bees and chickens. The bulk of the Project site supports native vegetation. Avocados were grown on the northeast portion of the site, and olive production may have occurred on southern portions of the site (individual trees are still present). The roads and trails within the Proposed Project site are used by equestrians, hikers, and bicyclists.

The topographic conditions noted above provide panoramic views to the north, west and south from western portions of the site and to the west from the northeastern portion of the site. Views easterly are blocked by the major hill noted under Project Vicinity Characteristics for most of the site and by a smaller hill and developed land uses to the east and north from the eastern portion of the site.

## S.2 Summary of Significant Effects and Mitigation Measures that Reduce or Avoid the Significant Effects

Table S-1, Summary of Significant Effects, located at the end of this chapter, provides a summary of significant environmental impacts resulting from Project implementation. Subchapter references referring to the detailed EIR analysis for each significant impact are provided in the table. Table S-1 also summarizes mitigation measures to reduce and/or avoid the environmental effects, with a conclusion as to whether the impact would be mitigated to below a level of significance. Detailed analyses of potentially significant environmental effects associated with Project implementation are provided in Chapter 2.0 of this EIR. Explanations of those effects found not to be significant are provided in Chapter 3.0. The summarized mitigation measures listed in Table S-1 are detailed in Chapter 7.0 of the EIR (List of Mitigation Measures and Environmental Design Considerations).

## S.3 Areas of Controversy

A Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) for the Proposed Project was initially circulated for public review from December 15, 2005 through January 30, 2006. Subsequent to that circulation, the Project Applicant relocated proposed emergency access to Cleveland Trail, and updated the Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA, Appendix F of this EIR). These changes resulted in recirculation of pertinent portions of the Draft MND in November and December 2007. Following the first recirculation, the TIA required further revision to incorporate the availability of the City of San Marcos Public Facilities Financing (PFF) Plan to address cumulative traffic issues in the city. During this time, new stormwater requirements also were incorporated into the Stormwater Management Plan and site plan. Based on these changes, additional portions of the Draft MND were recirculated in October and November 2008.

During these publications of the Draft MND, comments were received from agencies/organizations and individuals regarding the Proposed Project. Issues raised in the comment letters on the Draft MNDs include concerns regarding the following issue areas:

- Traffic and safety (e.g., potentially significant direct and cumulative traffic impacts; safe and adequate sight distances at driveways and intersections, particularly at the intersection of Sugarbush Drive/Buena Creek Road)

- Fire issues (e.g., emergency vehicle ingress/egress and environmental effects associated with providing this access: the use of Lone Oak Lane and Lone Oak Road was unacceptable; the Project emergency access was moved to Cleveland Trail; urban/wildland interface)
- Development of adjacent properties
- Community character/aesthetics effects (e.g., neighbors concerned about the appropriateness of clustering on site, the visual effect of development on site/ presence of a western retaining wall)
- Biological resources impacts (e.g., loss of habitat; wildlife movement; placement of the proposed extension of Sugarbush Drive on site)

Issues raised within letters on the Draft MND are evaluated in this EIR in Chapters 2.0 and 3.0.

The County determined that an EIR was required for the Proposed Project. Accordingly, a Notice of Preparation (NOP) of an EIR was distributed on April 9, 2009, for a 30-day public review and comment period. Public comments were received on the NOP for this EIR and reflect concern or controversy over a number of environmental issues. (Refer to Appendix A for the NOP and NOP comment letters.)

## S.4 Issues to be Resolved by the Decision-making Body

Under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), an EIR is an informational document intended to inform the public agency decision makers and the public of the significant effects of a project, identify possible ways to minimize the significant effects, and describe reasonable alternatives to the project. The lead agency (in this case the County) must respond to each significant effect identified in this EIR by making "Findings" for each significant effect. The decision makers can also decide whether to implement a project alternative or combination of alternatives.

## S.5 Project Alternatives

Four Project alternatives were identified for further analysis, including two No Project scenarios (no development and development under existing plans/zoning), a Reduced Project alternative, and an Alternative Location alternative. These alternatives are evaluated in Chapter 4.0 of this EIR. Environmental effects are compared to those of the Proposed Project and the alternatives are assessed relative to their ability to meet the basic objectives of the Project. A comparison of impacts associated with the Proposed Project and each alternative is provided in Table 4-1, Comparison of Project Alternative Impacts to Proposed Project Impacts.

### No Project/No Development Alternative

The No Project/No Development Alternative assumes that the Project site continues in an undeveloped state of native and non-native habitats over the long term. The 94.4 acres of native habitat throughout the site would remain, with the possible exception of limited fuel management for adjacent residential properties. The Proposed Project, including supporting infrastructure (i.e., roadways and utilities connections), would not be constructed.

The No Project/No Development Alternative is environmentally superior to the Proposed Project because it would avoid the environmental impacts associated with the Proposed Project. This alternative also would not develop housing on the property, which is the land use specified in the General Plan for the property. The No Project/No Development Alternative would not meet the basic Project objective of providing a residential development.

**No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative**

Under the No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative, development would occur in accordance with the site's existing zoning, and also would conform to General Plan designations and NCM Subregional Plan standards. The Project site's land use designation, (17) Estate Residential, generally requires minimum parcel sizes of two or four acres or larger, depending on slope criteria. This alternative assumes that no clustering would occur, and that the alternative would be consistent with the NCM Subregional Plan and the current zoning requirements for minimum two-acre lot sizes. Thus, the No Project/Existing Plan Alternative would include 26 residential lots with a minimum lot size of two acres and two lots with detention/bioretention basins. No GPA or rezone would be required.

This alternative would arrange residential lots along one, rather than two, residential streets. The disturbance footprint for the area south of Cleveland Trail would be essentially the same as that for the Proposed Project. Although lots would extend further to the east than with the Proposed Project (to achieve the two-acre minimum lot size), the developed portions of the eastern lots would be restricted to retain the same 500-foot wide open space corridor proposed for the Project. This corridor would be placed within a biological open space easement. North of the future Sugarbush Drive extension, several lots to the northwest and southeast of the new road in areas that would be in open space under the Proposed Project. An approximately 525-foot-wide area would be provided across Sugarbush Drive. The lots located east of Sugarbush Drive would be a minimum of four acres, due to the steepness of the slopes in this area. In each of these areas, the buildable pad would be located close to the future street or abutting existing residential lots, and the portion of the lot beyond the limits of grading would be placed within a biological open space easement. Earthwork would be balanced on site, with approximately 345,000 cubic yards each of cut and fill. Slope heights along the site's western boundary (south of Cleveland Trail) would range from approximately 30 to 60 feet in height in order to support pads adequate for larger homes and associated ancillary structures anticipated for two-acre, rather than half-acre, lots. In other respects (e.g., landscaping along Sugarbush Drive and the detention/ bioretention basins, emergency access, off-site utility improvements, etc.), this alternative generally would be consistent with the Proposed Project.

The No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative would reduce associated traffic generation, thereby avoiding a significant direct impact to Robelini Drive between South Santa Fe Avenue and SR 78. With regard to aesthetics issues, given competing interests of immediately abutting neighbors, and the overall consistency with general community design shared by both designs, this alternative is preferred over the Proposed Project. With regard to other environmental issues, the Proposed Project would be environmentally preferred (in most cases, incrementally) over this alternative, due to the increased amount of affected land associated with the No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative. While this alternative would meet most of the identified project objectives, it might not be possible to accomplish mitigation for upland habitats entirely on site under this alternative.

**Reduced Project Alternative**

The Reduced Project Alternative would include 28 residential lots with a minimum lot size of one acre and 2 lots with detention/bioretention basins. As described in Section 3.1.4, clustering on lot sizes a minimum of one acre would be permitted under the existing General Plan designation and the NCM Subregional Plan. No GPA would be required. This alternative would still require a Rezone, because it would not be consistent with the current zoning requirements for minimum two-acre lot sizes.

This alternative would arrange residential lots along one, rather than two, residential streets. The disturbance footprint for the area south of Cleveland Trail would be essentially the same as that for the Proposed Project. The grading footprint would be reduced, and earthwork would be balanced on site,

with approximately 238,000 cubic yards each of cut and fill. This alternative would, however, include four residential lots to the north of Cleveland Trail, in an area that would include a detention/bioretention basin and open space under the Proposed Project. An open space easement would be placed on these lots beyond the limits of grading. South of the Cleveland Trail junction, 11 residential lots would be sited along the western property line under this alternative, compared to 8 under the Proposed Project. Slope heights along the western property line generally would range from approximately 16 to 40 feet in height, although there would be a slope between one basin and the adjacent residential pad of 63 feet. In other respects (e.g., landscaping, emergency access, off-site utility improvements, etc.), this alternative generally would be consistent with the Proposed Project.

The Reduced Project Alternative would reduce impacts to sensitive biological habitat and adverse noise effects and also would reduce associated traffic generation, thereby avoiding a significant direct impact to Robelini Drive between South Santa Fe Avenue and SR 78. Visual impacts would be slightly reduced due to the elimination of an internal street that could be seen by off-site more distant viewers, as well as increased distances from existing homes to manufactured slopes supporting Project residential uses.

**Environmentally Superior Alternative**

Although the No Project/No Build Alternative would result in minimal to substantially reduced environmental impacts, Section 15126.6(e)(2) of the State CEQA Guidelines requires identification of an alternative other than the No Project as the environmentally superior alternative.

The Reduced Project Alternative is considered the Environmentally Superior Alternative mainly because traffic generation is reduced, avoiding a significant direct impact to Robelini Drive between South Santa Fe Avenue and SR 78.

**Table S-1**
**SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS**

| **SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS MITIGATED TO A LEVEL OF LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT** | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Project-level Impacts** | | | |
| **Impact No.** | **Impact** | **Mitigation** | **Significance After Mitigation** |
| **2.1 Aesthetics** | | | |
| ***2.1.2.2 Introduction of Features Detracting from or Contrasting with Existing Visual Character*** | | | |
| AE-1 | Given the necessary Project grading/slope creation along the western Project boundary, routine Project planting would not adequately address short-term visual effects to adjacent off-site viewers. A significant impact was identified to these viewers until vegetation would adequately obscure the manufactured slope. | M-AE-1 – Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the subdivider shall obtain approval from the Director of the Department of Planning and Land Use (DPLU) of the detailed and final Landscape Plan for visual screening of manufactured slopes. This Project must conform to the following:<br>• The detailed Landscape Plan must conform to the Concept Landscape Plan discussed in this EIR, and also will include incorporation of denser planting and larger container stock along the western property line south of Cleveland Trail.<br>• The detailed Landscape Plan must be approved prior to obtaining any building or other permit pursuant to the Project Site Plan, and prior to commencement of construction or use of the property in reliance on the Site Plan.<br>• The detailed Landscape Plan must conform to the requirements of the County's Landscape Water Conservation Ordinance and Design Manual, and Project FPP.<br>• The detailed Landscape Plan also must address the maintenance of proposed landscaping and required fire walls. Ongoing maintenance will be the responsibility of the private HOA. All landscaping is required to be maintained in a healthy, disease-free condition for the life of the Project. | Less than Significant |

**Table S-1 (cont.)**
**SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS**

| SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS MITIGATED TO A LEVEL OF LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Project-level Impacts** | | | |
| **Impact No.** | **Impact** | **Mitigation** | **Significance After Mitigation** |
| **2.2 Biological Resources** | | | |
| ***2.2.2.1 Riparian Habitat and Other Sensitive Natural Communities*** | | | |
| BI-1a | The Project would result in significant impacts to 0.6 acre of coast live oak woodland (including 0.1 acre associated with on-site grading, 0.1 acre associated with off-site grading and 0.4 acre of oak root zone impacts). | M-BI-1a – Impacts to 0.6 acre of coast live oak woodland shall be mitigated on site. Approximately 0.4 acre of existing coast live oak woodland shall be within the on-site biological open space easement. Approximately 0.9 acre of coast live oak woodland creation shall occur on existing non-native grassland and disturbed habitat within the biological open space. | Less than Significant |
| BI-1b | The Project would result in significant impacts to 23.1 acres of Diegan coastal sage scrub (including 21.7 acres associated with on-site grading and 1.4 acres associated with on-site brush management). | M-BI-1b – Impacts to 23.3 acres of Diegan coastal sage scrub shall be mitigated through on-site preservation at a 2:1 ratio (46.6 acres). | Less than Significant |
| BI-1c | The Project would result in significant impacts to 11.1 acres of non-native grassland (including 10.4 acres associated with off-site grading, 0.1 acre associated with brush management and 0.6 acre associated with on-site habitat creation). | M-BI-1c – Impacts to 11.1 acres of non-native grassland shall be mitigated at a 0.5:1 ratio. This requirement shall be partially met through on-site preservation of 2.4 acres of non-native grassland within the biological open space easement. The remainder of the requirement shall be met through on-site preservation of 3.2 acres of grass-dominated coastal sage scrub within the biological open space. | Less than Significant |
| BI-2 | The Project would significantly impact 170 linear feet (320 square feet) of drainage that is considered an ephemeral ACOE and CDFG jurisdictional non-wetland Waters of the U.S. and a CDFG jurisdictional streambed. | M-BI-2 – Impacts to 170 linear feet (320 square feet) of drainage jurisdictional to the ACOE and CDFG shall be met through removal of exotic plant species, including castor bean (*Ricinus communis*) and fennel (*Foeniculum vulgare*), from the length of the drainage. The Project Applicant shall obtain applicable regulatory permits from other agencies. | Less than Significant |

**Table S-1 (cont.)**
**SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS**

| SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS MITIGATED TO A LEVEL OF LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Project-level Impacts** | | | |
| **Impact No.** | **Impact** | **Mitigation** | **Significance After Mitigation** |
| **2.2 Biological Resources (cont.)** | | | |
| ***2.2.2.1 Riparian Habitat and Other Sensitive Natural Communities (cont.)*** | | | |
| BI-3 | Colonization of non-native plant species in non-impact areas due to potential use of non-native plant species by residents in their yards and the resulting degradation of native habitat would be significant should it occur. | M-BI-3 – The following measures shall be implemented to mitigate potential impacts associated with further colonization by non-native plant species:<br>• The conceptual landscape plans include specifics regarding the types of plant species allowed along the Project footprint boundary. The final landscape plans shall be reviewed prior to approval to ensure that no invasive non-native plants (as identified by the California Invasive Plant Council) are used adjacent to any biological open space areas.<br>• The Project Applicant shall implement the required HMP (Appendix H of EIR Appendix D) for the Proposed Project, including habitat monitoring and management to identify and minimize potential indirect effects to open space resources; exotic species control; and implementation of a homeowners' education program to educate residents of the sensitivity of the resources in the biological open space, basic stewardship, and prohibited/allowed activities in the open space. The conceptual HMP is a draft document that sets guidelines. A final Resource Management Plan (RMP) shall be prepared prior to Project grading. | Less than Significant |

**Table S-1 (cont.)**
**SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS**

| SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS MITIGATED TO A LEVEL OF LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Project-level Impacts** | | | |
| **Impact No.** | **Impact** | **Mitigation** | **Significance After Mitigation** |
| **2.2 Biological Resources (cont.)** | | | |
| ***2.2.2.1 Riparian Habitat and Other Sensitive Natural Communities (cont.)*** | | | |
| BI-4 | Increases in human activity in the area could result in degradation of sensitive vegetation, which would be significant. | M-BI-4 – The following measures shall be implemented to reduce impacts from edge effects and human activity:<br>• The limits of grading shall be flagged or marked with silt fencing prior to grading to prevent inadvertent impacts to adjacent sensitive habitat. Prior to brushing, a qualified biologist shall review the flagging and fencing.<br>• A qualified biologist shall monitor the limits of grading during clearing, grubbing, and grading, as well as during trenching within Cleveland Trail and excavation of the jacking pits for installation of the sewer line between Cleveland Trail and Buena Creek Road. Monitoring shall be conducted once per day with weekly reports submitted to the County DPLU. If inadvertent impacts occur, they shall be reported to the appropriate agency within 24 hours.<br>• The preserved open space areas shall be fenced off from the backyards of the proposed homes, and delineated with split rail fences along roadways adjacent to the open space preserve.<br>• After completion of grading, permanent signs stating the following shall be erected along the limits of the open space:<br>Sensitive Environmental Resources<br>Disturbance Beyond this Point is Restricted by Easement<br><br>Information:<br>Contact County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use<br>Ref: 02-08-047 | Less than Significant |

**Table S-1 (cont.)**
**SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS**

| SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS MITIGATED TO A LEVEL OF LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Project-level Impacts** | | | |
| **Impact No.** | **Impact** | **Mitigation** | **Significance After Mitigation** |
| **2.2 Biological Resources (cont.)** | | | |
| ***2.2.2.2 Special Status Species (cont.)*** | | | |
| BI-4 (cont.) | | • The Project applicant shall implement the required HMP (Appendix H of EIR Appendix D) for the Proposed Project, as outlined in M-BI-3. | |
| BI-5 | The Project would significantly impact the federal-listed threatened coastal California gnatcatcher by direct loss of habitat. Impacts to individual birds also would be considered significant should they occur. | M-BI-5 – Impacts related to loss of habitat for the coastal California gnatcatcher shall be mitigated through on-site Diegan coastal sage scrub preservation, as specified in M-BI-1c. Diegan coastal sage scrub supporting nesting gnatcatchers shall not be removed during the breeding season (February 15 through August 30 or until all nesting is complete). Prior to construction, demonstration of the absence of gnatcatchers shall require surveys pursuant to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) protocol, with clearing of unoccupied habitat requiring concurrence of the wildlife agencies. | Less than Significant |
| BI-6 | The Project would result in the direct loss of approximately 12.8 acres of raptor foraging habitat, which would constitute a significant impact. | M-BI-6 – Impacts related to loss of raptor foraging habitat shall be mitigated through on-site preservation of Diegan coastal sage scrub and non-native grassland, as specified in M-BI-1c and M-BI-1d. | Less than Significant |
| BI-7 | Clearing of habitat that supports nesting migratory birds would constitute a significant impact. | M-BI-7 – Compliance with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) requires vegetation clearing to occur outside of the breeding season (February 15 through August 31). If clearing must occur during the breeding season, a pre-construction survey shall be conducted to determine the presence or absence of nesting birds within the project footprint. If no nests are found, clearing may commence. If nests are found, clearing shall be postponed until after the breeding season. | Less than Significant |

**Table S-1 (cont.)**
**SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS**

| SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS MITIGATED TO A LEVEL OF LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Project-level Impacts** | | | |
| **Impact No.** | **Impact** | **Mitigation** | **Significance After Mitigation** |
| **2.2 Biological Resources (cont.)** | | | |
| ***2.2.2.2 Special Status Species (cont.)*** | | | |
| BI-8 | Significant impacts to coastal California gnatcatcher would occur if active nests are removed or if grading, clearing or construction activities occur within 300 feet of an active nest. | M-BI-8 – No grading or clearing shall be initiated within 300 feet of occupied habitat during coastal California gnatcatcher breeding season (February 15 through August 31). All grading permits, grading plans and improvement plans shall state the same. If clearing or grading would occur during gnatcatcher nesting season, a qualified biologist shall conduct a pre-construction survey, pursuant to USFWS protocol, to determine if this species occurs within impacted areas. With concurrence of the wildlife agencies and the County of San Diego, if there are no gnatcatchers nesting (including nest building or other breeding/nesting behavior) within this area, development shall be allowed to proceed. | Less than Significant |
| BI-9 | Significant impacts to raptors would occur if active nests are removed or if grading, clearing or construction activities occur within 500 feet of active nests of tree-nesting raptors or 800 feet of active nests of ground-nesting raptors. | M-BI-9 – No grading or clearing shall be initiated within 500 feet of occupied tree-nesting raptor habitat during raptor breeding season (January 15 through July 15), or within 800 feet of ground-nesting raptor habitat during raptor breeding season (February 1 through July 15). All grading permits, grading plans and improvement plans shall state the same. If clearing or grading would occur during raptor nesting seasons, a qualified biologist shall conduct a pre-construction survey to determine if these species occur within impacted areas. If there are no raptors nesting (including nest building or other breeding/nesting behavior) within this area, development shall be allowed to proceed. If a nest occurs in a tree to be impacted, the tree shall not be removed while the nest is active (potentially, January through July). | Less than Significant |

**Table S-1 (cont.)**
**SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS**

**SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS MITIGATED TO A LEVEL OF LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT**

**Project-level Impacts**

| Impact No. | Impact | Mitigation | Significance After Mitigation |
|---|---|---|---|
| | **2.2 Biological Resources (cont.)** | | |
| ***2.2.2.2 Special Status Species (cont.)*** | | | |
| BI-10 | Construction noise exceeding 60 dBA $L_{eq}$ within areas with nesting gnatcatchers or raptors would be considered a significant impact. | M-BI-10 – Construction activities shall not take place in proximity to an active gnatcatcher nest such that noise levels exceed 60 dBA $L_{eq}$. Noise levels will be periodically monitored by the monitoring biologist and/or a noise specialist. Indirect impacts to raptor nests shall be mitigated through placement of a construction buffer, as specified in M-BI-9. | Less than Significant |
| | **2.3 Cultural Resources** | | |
| ***2.3.2.1 Cultural Resources*** | | | |
| CR-1a | On-site brushing and initial grading activities associated with construction of the Proposed Project could result in the discovery of previously unrecorded, potentially significant, archaeological resources. Such impacts to uncovered cultural resources on site could be significant. | M-CR-1 – Direct impacts to buried, previously unrecorded cultural resources will be mitigated through execution of a grading monitoring and potential subsequent data recovery program. Prior to approval of grading or improvement plans, the Project Applicant shall implement a grading monitoring and data recovery program to the satisfaction of the Director of DPLU. The program will include monitoring by a County-certified archaeologist/historian and Native American monitor; documenting identified isolates and clearly non-significant deposits; halting/diverting grading activities and contacting the County in the event that potentially significant cultural resources are discovered; preparing a Research Design and Data Recovery Program for any significant cultural resources; notifying the County Coroner and (if applicable) NAHC if any human remains or grave goods are discovered; recording, processing and curating any discovered cultural resources; and reporting the results of the monitoring program to the County.<br><br>Refer to M-CR-1 in Chapter 7.0 for the complete mitigation measure. | Less than Significant |
| CR-1b | A significant impact would occur if human remains are unearthed during grading activities. | | Less than Significant |

**Table S-1 (cont.)**
**SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS**

| SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS MITIGATED TO A LEVEL OF LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Project-level Impacts** | | | |
| **Impact No.** | **Impact** | **Mitigation** | **Significance After Mitigation** |
| **2.4 Transportation/Traffic** | | | |
| ***2.4.2.3 Existing Plus Project Roadway Segment Impacts*** | | | |
| TR-1 | Under Existing Plus Project conditions, direct impacts would occur on the following roadway segments:<br>a. South Santa Fe Avenue from Robelini Drive to Buena Creek Road<br>b. Robelini Drive from South Santa Fe Avenue to University Drive | M-TR-1 – Direct impacts to Robelini Drive and South Santa Fe Avenue shall be mitigated as follows:<br>a. and b. The Project Applicant shall extend the northbound right-turn lane on Robelini Drive at South Santa Fe Avenue from the current 130 feet in length to 260 feet in length. | Less than Significant |
| ***2.4.2.4 Existing Plus Project Intersection Impacts*** | | | |
| TR-2 | Under Existing Plus Project conditions, direct impacts would occur at the following intersection:<br>a. Buena Creek Road/Monte Vista Drive | M-TR-2 – Direct impacts to the Buena Creek Road/Monte Vista Drive intersection shall be mitigated as follows:<br>a. The Project Applicant shall provide a dedicated right-turn lane on Buena Creek Road at Monte Vista Drive to the satisfaction of the County of San Diego. | Less than Significant |
| TR-3 | During Project construction, direct impacts to traffic flow would occur where water and sewer lines join existing mains in Buena Creek Road. | M-TR-3 – Direct impacts to Buena Creek Road during connection of Project water and sewer lines to existing mains in the roadway shall be mitigated as follows:<br>a. Prior to commencement of pipeline installation work, a Traffic Control Plan for Buena Creek Road shall be prepared and approved by the County. | Less than Significant |

**Table S-1 (cont.)**
**SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS**

| **SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS MITIGATED TO A LEVEL OF LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT** | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Project-level Impacts** | | | |
| **Impact No.** | **Impact** | **Mitigation** | **Significance After Mitigation** |
| **2.4 Transportation/Traffic (cont.)** | | | |
| ***2.4.3.1 Existing Plus Cumulative Projects Plus Project Roadway Segment Impacts*** | | | |
| TR-4 | Under Existing Plus Cumulative Projects Plus Project conditions, the Proposed Project would contribute to significant cumulative impacts to the following seven roadway segments:<br>a. Buena Creek Road from South Santa Fe Avenue to North Twin Oaks Valley Road<br>b. South Santa Fe Avenue from Robelini Drive to Smilax Road<br>c. Monte Vista Drive from Robin Place to Buena Creek Road<br>d. North Twin Oaks Valley Road from Buena Creek Road to La Cienega Road<br>e. Robelini Drive from South Santa Fe Avenue to University Drive<br>f. Deer Springs Road from North Twin Oaks Valley Road to I-15 | M-TR-4 – Existing Plus Cumulative Plus Project impacts to roadway segments shall be mitigated as follows:<br>a. The Project Applicant shall participate in the County's Traffic Impact Fee (TIF) program to mitigate impacts to the portion of Buena Creek Road within the County. The Project Applicant shall provide payment toward the City of San Marcos Public Facilities Financing (PFF) fee program to mitigate impacts to the portion of Buena Creek Road in the City of San Marcos.<br>b. The Project Applicant shall participate in the County's TIF program to mitigate impacts to South Santa Fe Avenue.<br>c. Cumulative impacts to the Monte Vista Drive segment will be mitigated through implementation of M-TR-2, above.<br>d. The Project Applicant shall provide payment toward the City of San Marcos PFF fee program to mitigate impacts to Twin Oaks Valley Road (Capital Improvement Projects [CIP] Projects 78, 87 and 88).<br>e. Cumulative impacts to Robelini Drive will be mitigated through implementation of M-TR-1 and through participation in the County's TIF program.<br>f. The Project Applicant shall participate in the County's TIF program to mitigate impacts to the portion of Deer Springs Road within the County. The Project Applicant shall provide payment toward the City of San Marcos PFF fee program to mitigate impacts to the portion of Deer Springs Road (CIP Project 78) in the City of San Marcos and through participation in the County's TIF program. | Less than Significant |

**Table S-1 (cont.)**
**SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS**

| SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS MITIGATED TO A LEVEL OF LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Project-level Impacts** | | | |
| **Impact No.** | **Impact** | **Mitigation** | **Significance After Mitigation** |
| **2.4 Transportation/Traffic (cont.)** | | | |
| ***2.4.3.1 Existing Plus Cumulative Projects Plus Project Roadway Segment Impacts (cont.)*** | | | |
| TR-5 | Under Existing Plus Cumulative Projects Plus Project conditions, the Proposed Project would contribute to significant cumulative impacts to the following six intersections:<br>a. SR 78/Sycamore Avenue Eastbound Ramps<br>b. Buena Creek Road/Monte Vista Drive<br>c. Buena Creek Road/Sugarbush Drive<br>d. Buena Creek Road/North Twin Oaks Valley Road<br>e. Deer Springs Road/North Twin Oaks Valley Road<br>f. Deer Springs Road/I-15 Interchange | M-TR-5 – Existing Plus Cumulative Plus Project impacts to intersections shall be mitigated as follows:<br>a. The Project Applicant shall contribute a fair share towards the City of Vista's planned restriping of the SR 78/Sycamore Avenue eastbound ramps intersection to change the middle lane to a shared thru/right/left-turn lane.<br>b. Cumulative impacts to the Buena Creek Road/Monte Vista Drive intersection will be mitigated through implementation of M-TR-2, above.<br>c. The Project Applicant shall construct a 150-foot long westbound left-turn lane (with a 120-foot bay taper) on Buena Creek Road at Sugarbush Drive.<br>d. The Project Applicant shall provide payment toward the City of San Marcos PFF fee program to mitigate impacts to Twin Oaks Valley Road at the Buena Creek Road intersection.<br>e. The Project Applicant shall provide payment toward the City of San Marcos PFF fee program to mitigate impacts to Twin Oaks Valley Road at the Deer Springs Road intersection.<br>f. The Project Applicant shall participate in the County's TIF program to mitigate impacts to the I-15/Deer Springs Road interchange intersection. | Less than Significant |

**Table S-1 (cont.)**
**SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS**

| SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS MITIGATED TO A LEVEL OF LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Project-level Impacts** | | | |
| **Impact No.** | **Impact** | **Mitigation** | **Significance After Mitigation** |
| **2.5 Noise** | | | |
| ***2.5.2.3 Construction Noise Level*** | | | |
| N-1 | A temporary significant impact associated with construction operations (ripping or drilling) may occur to off-site residences. | M-N-1-Prior to the approval of any plans, issuance of any permit, and approval of any final map(s), evidence shall be provided to the satisfaction of the Director of DPW that "Specific Environmental Notes" have been placed on the grading and/or improvement plans. If ripping and/or drilling is required on Lots 8 or 9, within 100-feet of a residential property line, an eight-foot tall noise barrier shall be erected along the length of the property line prior to the initiation of such activities. A barrier with a total length of 150 feet (75 feet along each side) adjacent to the corner of the property lines (Figure 2.5-2) will block the line of sight between the residential property and any ripping operations within 100 feet of the property. The sound attenuation barrier shall be a single, solid sound wall and shall be sited at the high point between the generated sound (at the ripping location) and the off-site sensitive receptor. The sound attenuation barrier shall be constructed of wood with no cracks or gaps through or below the wall. Any seams or cracks must be filled or caulked. The wood can be tongue and groove and must be at least one-inch thick or have a surface density of at least 3.5 pounds per square foot. | Less than Significant |

**Table S-1 (cont.)**
**SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS**

| SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS MITIGATED TO A LEVEL OF LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Project-level Impacts** | | | |
| **Impact No.** | **Impact** | **Mitigation** | **Significance After Mitigation** |
| **2.5 Noise (cont.)** | | | |
| ***2.5.2.3 Construction Noise Level (cont.)*** | | | |
| N-2 | A temporary significant noise impact would occur in association with construction of the Proposed Project and the off-site improvements to Cleveland Trail. | M-N-2a – Prior to the approval of any plans, issuance of any permit, and approval of any final map(s), evidence shall be provided to the satisfaction of the Director of DPW that "Specific Environmental Notes" have been placed on the grading and/or improvement plans. These notes shall specify that heavy equipment planned to be used for the Project are in compliance with Sections 36.409 and 36.410 of the Noise Ordinance or construction activities will be limited to four hours per day on Lots D, E, F and 1 through 9. | Less than Significant |

**Table S-1 (cont.)**
**SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS**

| SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS MITIGATED TO A LEVEL OF LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Project-level Impacts** | | | |
| **Impact No.** | **Impact** | **Mitigation** | **Significance After Mitigation** |
| **2.5 Noise (cont.)** | | | |
| ***2.5.2.3 Construction Noise Level (cont.)*** | | | |
| N-2 (cont.) | | M-N-2b – Prior to the approval of any plans, issuance of any permit, and approval of any final map(s), evidence shall be provided to the satisfaction of the Director of DPW that "Specific Environmental Notes" have been placed on the grading and/or improvement plans. These notes shall specify that heavy equipment planned to be used for the Project are in compliance with Sections 36.409 and 36.410 of the Noise Ordinance, construction activities will be limited to four hours per day on Cleveland Trail or temporary noise barriers shall be constructed prior to the initiation of grading activities on Cleveland Trail. The barrier shall be 12 feet high to block the line-of-sight between the construction equipment and the adjacent residences, and shall be constructed along the length of the residential property line, subject to the barrier design specifications provided in M-N-1. | |

**Table S-1 (cont.)**
**SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS**

| SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS MITIGATED TO A LEVEL OF LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Project-level Impacts** | | | |
| **Impact No.** | **Impact** | **Mitigation** | **Significance After Mitigation** |
| **2.5 Noise (cont.)** | | | |
| ***2.5.2.3 Construction Noise Level (cont.)*** | | | |
| N-2 (cont.) | | M-N-2c – Noise monitoring shall be conducted by an approved County noise consultant during the initial construction equipment operations to ensure that noise levels comply with County Noise Ordinance Section 36.409. Noise monitoring is for construction equipment operations along the western boundary line and improvements to Cleveland Trail. If noise monitoring indicates that the County noise criteria may be exceeded, subsequent monitoring will be conducted after implementation of remedial noise abatement measures. A noise report summarizing the results shall be filed to the satisfaction of the Director of DPLU.<br><br>M-N-2d – Residents within 200 feet of the construction activities shall be notified of the construction schedule at least one week prior to initial activities. Noticing for any blasting activities would be performed as required under Section 96.1.3301.2 of the County Code. | |

**Table S-1 (cont.)**
**SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS**

| SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS MITIGATED TO A LEVEL OF LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Project-level Impacts** | | | |
| **Impact No.** | **Impact** | **Mitigation** | **Significance After Mitigation** |
| **2.6 Paleontology** | | | |
| PAL-1 | The Proposed Project could result in significant impacts to paleontological resources from the excavation of previously undisturbed deposits exhibiting marginal resource potential (i.e., volcaniclastic units of the Santiago Peak Volcanics). | M-PAL-1 – Prior to the approval of any plans, issuance of any permit, and approval of any final map(s), evidence shall be provided to the satisfaction of the Director of DPW that "Specific Environmental Notes" have been placed on the grading and/or improvement plans. These notes shall specify that if fossils greater than 12 inches are discovered, grading shall be terminated; if any paleontological resources are discovered, necessary monitoring, recovery and subsequent work shall be completed by or under the supervision of a Qualified Paleontologist; and if no paleontological resources are discovered, a "No Fossils Found" letter shall be prepared. Refer to M-PAL-1 in Chapter 7.0 for the complete mitigation measure. | Less than Significant |

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK